

January 4, 1962.

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL



Dear Lucius:

Your much appreciated year-end letter has touched me deeply. I agree wholly with your analysis of the trend in our own and in allied countries; and, perhaps, take a darker view than you do of the prospects of a change in it. Specifically, and immediately, I am gloomy about the outcome of the confrontation over Berlin, since we and our allies have not taken the action necessary to change the environment in which it takes place. By this I mean action which would convince the Russians that the phrase "firm about Berlin," would mean the use of all means at our disposal to prevent them having their way and to preserve the status quo ante the wall. Only if they are so convinced, can all of us hope to go ahead toward the unity of the West and the reunification of Germany within it. This would call for immediate (as of this January) build-up to the NATO force goals in Europe (including five more divisions of ours) with the evident and real intent to use them, if necessary, with SAC in support. Without giving hostages to performance, the threat to use SAC carries no conviction.

Perhaps, indeed probably, our allies would have been scared to death and unwilling to go through with such a program; but, even so, it is better to have the followers desert the leader, than to have the leader follow the followers. Who then picks up the pieces? Who is trusted to lead in a new start?

The Honorable
Lucius D. Clay,
c/o The Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

Admission 1/65 / 'State Dept & WH Advisor 1962. Jan - Dec 1



I have always thought that the expression, "There is no alternative to negotiations," was a silly one, because there are the obvious alternatives to fight and to surrender. If we are not prepared for the first of these, it seems pretty likely we will end up with the second.

Alice and I are off on Sunday for a month in the Far East, where the prospect, if no more pleasing, is, at least, different.

With warm regards.

Sincerely,